



Serial Number: 09/070,908 Filing Date: 05/04/98 First Named Applicant: SAKAMA Attorney Docket No.: 0756-1799

IM62/0816
SIXBY FRIEDMAN LEEDOM & FERGUSON
2010 CORPORATE RIDGE
SUTIE 600
MCLEAN VA 22102

EXAMINER
PADGETT, M

ART UNIT: 1762 PAPER NUMBER: 8

DATE MAILED: 06/16/99

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☒ is extended to run 5 months or continues to run _____ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Appellant's response to the final rejection, filed 8/2/99 (or 7/29/99 - certificate of mailing) has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☒ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: In claim 23, "a hydrogen gas" was introduced in line 2, hence in line 8, changing "said" to "a" creates antecedent basis problems, therefore a new issue, as does changing "said" to "a" in line 9 for "silicon containing gas" which was introduced in line 5. Analogous problems are introduced into the other independent claims. Also in the last line of claim 23 "an amorphous film..." also has had the article incorrectly change

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____
Claims objected to: _____
Claims rejected: 23-50

However;

☒ Appellant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): some of the 112 problems, but not all noted on the paper # 6 rejection would be corrected by this amendment.

4. ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because appellant's apparent contention that since they teach an amorphous Si film (ie a film only about Si) that they are entitled to claim any amorphous film as long as it contains at least some Si. This is not convincing.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☐ Other

MARIANNE PADGETT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1100